MINUTES OF THE HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

CITY OF SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA

Lower Level – Room 41, City Hall/Court House, 15 West Kellogg Boulevard **June 9, 2011**

Present: Richard Dana, Robert Ferguson, Jennifer Haskamp, Renee Hutter, Rich Laffin, John

Manning, Steve Trimble, Diane Trout-Oertel, Mark Thomas, Matt Mazanec

Absent: Matt Hill (excused), David Riehle (unexcused)

Staff Present: Amy Spong, Christine Boulware, Becky Willging

BUSINESS MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER: 5:06 by Chair Manning

- **II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:** Commissioner Laffin motioned to approve the agenda, Commissioner Dana seconded the motion. The motion passed 10-0.
- III. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: None were discussed.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES:

- A. April 14, 2011 Business Meeting
- B. April 28, 2011 Public Hearing/Permit Review
- C. May 12, 2011 Business Meeting

Commissioner Laffin noted that in the May 12 minutes, on page 7 under New Business, "solar ray" should be corrected to read "solar array" in two locations. Commissioner Trout-Oertel motioned to approve the meeting minutes; Commissioner Dana seconded the motion. The motion was passed 10-0.

V. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS: Chair Manning stated that some members of the retreat groups wanted to connect after the business meeting to share notes.

VI. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- **A.** May Design Review Statistics Staff informed that 59 permits were approved in May. Chair Manning asked how the number compares with past months. Staff Boulware said that reviews pick up in May, and usually they see 30-40, 59 is high, and the highest they've seen was 76 in June 2010, which is twice as many as usual.
- **B.** Legislative Hearing Notification Not discussed.
- **C.** Advanced Section 106 Training Staff Spong said that she will share the information she learned with the Commission and put it into a format that is applicable.

VII. HISTORIC RESOURCE REVIEW:

A. 936 Earl Street, *Historic Resource Review* on a nuisance property declared by the Department of Safety and Inspections, Division of Code Enforcement. The property is a Vacant Building Category 3 and has been issued an order to abate. State Inventory #RA-SPC-1120

Staff read the report recommending that the city council delay the demolition of the site in order for alternatives be explored and that a qualified historian be hired to evaluate both National Register and local eligibility of the house and its contribution to the Payne-Phalen neighborhood. Staff showed pictures of the property and discussed specific details of the house. Commissioner Mazanec asked about the status of previous HPC recommendation of properties that have undergone historic resource reviews. Staff

replied that properties such as 686 Bradley have been discussed further, but have not had a formal hearing yet, and 763 Fourth Street will return to the Legislative Hearing Officer for recommendation. Commissioner Laffin asked if the house is actually in the Payne-Phalen neighborhood. Staff replied that it is, but it is outside of the boundaries of the Legacy Survey area. Commissioner Laffin said that the house acts as a great entry to the heart of the neighborhood, especially paired with the house across the street, which also has a tower. Staff noted there are several houses on Sims and Case and between Payne and Greenbrier that have been reviewed within the past few years, but many have been demolished and some have been pattern book houses like the one at 936 Earl. She said that the 1983 survey identified potential for a historic district in that neighborhood, and though the integrity of the district may no longer existing, there still may be potential for a thematic nomination of pattern book houses, in which 936 Earl would most likely be contributing.

Commissioner Trimble asked if a bank owns the property now. Staff replied said yes, it's owned by the Federal National Mortgage Association. Commissioner Dana moved adoption of the staff recommendation; Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. Commissioner Trimble said that the tax credits might give hope to the property. Staff clarified that the property would need to be income producing and listed on the National Register or eligible for listing. Chair Manning said the approach should include a search for alternatives to demolition as well as evaluating the property in terms of designation. Commissioner Laffin referred to the finding in the staff report that said that asbestos shingles had be removed and the original siding was found intact and without excessive nail holes, which is encouraging that the detailing and siding is actually in really good shape. The motion was passed 10-0.

VIII. PERMIT REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Summit Avenue south frontage road east of Snelling Avenue, Summit Avenue West Historic District, by Public Works Traffic Engineering, for a Certificate of Approval to realign the Summit Avenue south frontage road to improve merging conditions. File #11-018 (Spong, 266-6714)

Staff read the report for Summit Avenue south frontage road east of Snelling Avenue, which included a description of the four options proposed to improve merging conditions at that intersection. Staff indicated that Option 3 was proposed as the best option for the intersection by Public Works. Staff recommended that Option 3 be approved with conditions. Staff showed pictures of the intersection and exhibits provided by Public Works.

Commissioner Riehle asked if the temporary installation in the intersection has been there since 2008. Public Works staff David Kuebler approached the commission and replied that the current configuration had been in place since the accident in 2008. Commissioner Trimble asked what the fatality was in 2008 and how many have there been over the years. Mr. Kuebler said that it was vehicular/bicycle accident in which the cyclist was eastbound on the bike lane, and the vehicle was at the merge condition seen in the photos. The bicycle was approaching the merge condition, the vehicle was approaching the stop sign, and the fatality occurred in the red zone seen in the picture. Mr. Kuebler stated they looked at the last 3-5 years of accident history, and there has only been one fatality; however, in the staff report provided to the HPC staff, there have been consistent near misses at the intersection that have not been reported. There have been comments provided by the husband of the woman who was killed expressing his desire to see the temporary solution become permanent because it makes the location more predictable and user friendly for bicycles and vehicles. Commissioner Dana asked what the condition of near misses was on the westbound side for cars that are trying to get onto the north frontage road. Mr. Kuebler said that it was different operationally in that the vehicle and bicycle are traveling in the same direction and

they're not separated by a major median, so there is still the visual connection between the bicyclist and vehicle and the near misses are a lot less frequent anecdotally than on the South side where there is a median separating the sightlines between the vehicle and the cyclist. Mr. Kuebler discussed the existing conditions and explained the three possible options for reconfiguring the intersection as shown in the exhibits.

Commissioner Manning asked if Option 3 most closely resembled the temporary configuration. Mr. Kuebler said it does. Commissioner Laffin asked if there would be a stop sign on the frontage road. Mr. Kuebler said it would continue to be stop controlled at that location. Commissioner Dana asked if the frontage road is the preferred means of getting from northbound Snelling to eastbound Summit. Mr. Kuebler said that they did not conduct any studies on that situation, but that there are a number of bicyclists and pedestrians that frequent that area because of Macalester College. Mr. Kuebler noted that he was on the Bicycle Advisory Board for a number of years that was incorporated into the Transportation Committee and comments were made at those meetings when the issue came up in 2008 which is why the temporary installation was put into place. He added that Option 3 meets the requirements in the HPC Staff Report as far as plantings, tree lines, or granite curbs.

Commissioner Dana said that the frontage road is frequently used as a shortcut and the stop sign is often ignored. Mr. Kuebler agreed that the stop sign often becomes a yield sign. Chair Manning asked if Option 3 changes the shape of the median. Mr. Kuebler said the medians remain untouched. Commissioner Laffin said that staff was rightly concerned about losing the symmetry of one side of the street to the other and because the islands are unaffected and the new bump out is so modest and serves an entirely different set of traffic conditions he feels that it is a smart decision. Mr. Kuebler clarified that a bump-out is different in operation and purpose than what is seen in the exhibits. Typically a bump-out chokes down an intersection and defines parking. What is seen in the exhibit is a redesign of a merge condition into more of a "t-intersection" condition.

Ms. Sally Spreeman approached the Commission. She is the Operations Manager for the Laura Jeffrey Academy at 1550 Summit Avenue. She asked if Exhibit 4 would eliminate parking in front of the church and school, which currently does not exist for school buses. Mr. Kuebler showed areas where there is currently parking and where parking will be eliminated, and where parking will remain. Ms. Spreeman asked if the area that will remain is public parking, and Mr. Kuebler said yes. Chair Manning asked if there was a plan to change the way parking is handled to the left of the intersection. Ms. Spreeman said the area going east in front of Thomas More is the school's bus parking. Chair Manning asked if Public Works had dealt with the school's issue of bus parking in their planning. Mr. Kuebler said that the thought was that since there was still some street parking they could do some mitigation of public parking and work with that area. Mr. Kuebler asked if the parking was used for daily drop-offs. Ms. Spreeman said that it was used for morning and afternoon drop-offs and field trips during the day, and there is a sign limiting parking during certain hours. She said that the bus company doesn't want to use the frontage strip because it is narrow and it's hard to make the turn off of Snelling. The school has four buses that pick up every day. Chair Manning asked how another space on the side street was used. Ms. Spreeman replied that a small area that leads in front of St. Paul's on-the-Hill Episcopal Church, which has limited public parking hours as well for buses. Chair Manning stated that the parking issue is beyond the purview of the HPC, but it is a conversation that the school should have with city. Ms. Spreeman said she called the city last year when they found out that something was being done.

Chair Manning asked if staff received any written testimony. Staff replied they received one email from Bethany Gladhill stating that SARPA is not in favor of any changes to the historic streetscape, and they are concerned with a sense of place of the street and its use by non-vehicular traffic. However, the use of the street by pedestrians and bicyclists is key to its character and they want it to be a safe and viable use. They feel that Option 3 best makes that compromise and is a better solution than what is in place right now.

The public hearing was closed. **Commissioner Dana motioned to adopt the staff recommendation; Commissioner Trout-Oertel seconded the motion.** Commissioner Dana clarified that the motion includes the staff recommendation indicating that Options 1 & 2 are denied. **The motion was passed 10-0.**

B. 255 E. 6th Street, Lowertown Historic District, by Gleeson Architects, for a Certificate of Approval to install glass block walls at the building corner on floors two through four, behind abandoned fire escape. File #11-017 (Spong, 266-6714)

Staff Spong summarized the staff report and said that the project has been before the Commission a few different times. The HPC approved new windows in the two upper floors; they conditionally approved the storefront system on the lower level, with a condition that a smaller design review committee be established. There are still three conditions from the first HPC decision that are considered as not met at this time. Staff Spong said that no solutions or agreement were arrived at between the applicant and design review committee. She said she also included an email from Cecile Bedor, PED Director who asked the city attorney to help staff with moving forward. The recommendation that came out of PED was to allow the applicant to re-apply to do the glass block. Staff Spong reviewed the findings and read the staff recommendations which were based on the discussion held on October 25, November 1, and April 11 between the applicant and the HPC. Staff recommends denial of the application as proposed, citing a possible alternative recommendation for the HPC to consider approving the glass block partition walls as proposed, provided that new fins are reinstalled in the corner or metal screening be installed in lieu of the fins. Staff showed pictures of the various stages of the project. Staff Spong clarified that there was a recommendation to the HPC at the October 25 meeting to paint the stairs a more subdued color and the Commissioner voted to not include that in the decision, so the red stair is allowed to remain. The stairs are not being addressed at this meeting.

Commissioner Dana asked if there were graphics showing what the glass block would look like. Staff Spong said there was a schematic rendering in the packet that was shown at the October meeting. Staff Spong said that there was a bird screen behind the fins, which was approved by staff, and that the glass block is the last piece that is needed for some type of enclosure. Commissioner Ferguson asked Staff Spong to clarify if the metal screening mentioned in the staff report referred to the screening for the birds. Staff Spong said yes, and that with the first recommendation in October she was suggesting that there were other options. She said there was a discussion at the last public meeting in October about using a different material for the red fabric banners such as metal and achieving both public art and restoring the corner. Chair Manning said that the second recommendation suggests that a different screening might be different than the mesh screening used to keep birds out. Commissioner Dana asked if there was a picture of the building before all of the fins were taken down. The applicant said he had some. Staff Spong said that they also approved of the fins being shortened in some areas because of excessive rust. Commissioner Laffin listed the three proposed changes, and asked if the Commission was only reviewing the glass block proposal and possible restoration of the corner at this meeting. Staff Spong confirmed that the HPC was only reviewing the glass block proposal, but that they needed to decide if the condition of restoring the corner should remain in effect. Commissioner Laffin asked if the first part of the staff recommendation was for denial of the glass block if the corner is not restored, and if Part B of the recommendation was to allow the glass block if the measures are taken to restore the corner. Staff Spong confirmed. The applicants, Mr. Dan Gleeson and Mr. Ed Hawksford, approached the Commission and showed pictures of the building. Mr. Gleeson asked why everything is being conditioned on the idea of boxiness and that they are not prepared to go back and redo the corner on that premise alone. Mr. Hawksford said that they want to get the building closed up and that they aren't saying that the glass block is the final solution, but it will be a backdrop for whatever the final design approval is for the building. He said that they want to get approval for the angled glass block walls, which covers less square footage than the building across the street. Mr. Gleeson said that even if they accept the boxiness it is compromised by the fact that the corner does not line up with the top

1960s floating element or the screening which is transparent. He said that their design approach was that they have an element hidden behind the screening, which is characteristic of the district, and the clipped corner, which is another characteristic of Lowertown. He said that if the HPC is superimposing boxiness as the only element they have to follow, then he says they are at a stalemate. He said that they would work with the progressing design as they are marketing the building, and that they are negotiating with two restaurant groups about an entrance feature and what they can do with the corners as far as signs, but they do involve something at the corner other than what is shown in the images. Mr. Hawksford said that it is part of an exploration of Lowertown artists or artists in general that can create the metal work for the exterior of the building, but it is contingent on the tenant that takes one of the upper floors. Mr. Gleeson said that the answer may have to be solved at a future date as they do marketing on the upper floors, and that they may have to put an extra stair tower in at that corner because of the distances code requires. Chair Manning asked why the applicants wanted to put glass block in even though they may have to put in an extra stair there. Mr. Gleeson said that glass block is a cheap installation. Mr. Hawksford agreed that it goes with the streetscape, it's an easy installation and easily removed installation and it will screen-off the direct view of the parking into that corner. Mr. Gleeson said he would not want to put in the screening in lieu of the glass block because it won't obscure the view of the parking. Commissioner Dana asked if there was a need to do anything further once the glass block is installed. Mr. Gleeson said he wanted to pursue some versatile and flanking elements on the corner in form of banners. Mr. Hawksford said that the building exceeds the property line and overhangs the sidewalk, and that the removal of the fins on the corner has opened the corner. Commissioner Laffin said that less than 10% of the building would be covered in glass block and asked what the functional use of the glass block is. Mr. Gleeson said that they think it is appropriate in Lowertown, and that he didn't know of any other material that would accomplish what they need. Mr. Hawksford clarified that the glass block will keep the pigeons out, obscure the parking, and create a neutral backdrop for whatever artwork will go on the corner. Commissioner Laffin said that the glass block was more of an aesthetic choice and not a functional choice, and that they could carry the bird screen around the corner of the building. Mr. Hawksford said that the bird screen wouldn't obscure the parking.

Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked the applicant to talk about what they are trying to achieve at the corner. Mr. Hawksford said that they are trying to give the building a sense of entry. Commissioner Trout-Oertel said that there are many ways to do that; however, the HPC has always put forth the condition that the corner should be restored and she thinks that can be done perhaps by some kind of support for future artwork. Mr. Hawksford said that support was already in place. Commissioner Trout-Oertel said that the HPC has asked for a solution to put back the corner and that there should be a way for the applicants to accomplish what they want and satisfy the requirement of the Commission, perhaps by using backlighting or keeping the fins in place. Mr. Hawksford said that the poles crowd the corner and exceed the public right-of-way, which is why clipped corners are present throughout the historic district. Staff Spong asked which buildings are clipped within the Lowertown District. Mr. Hawksford said that the Allen Building was clipped. Staff Boulware said that the Allen Building does not hold the corner of the street. Mr. Hawksford said that there is another clipped corner building on Wall Street as well as an exposed fire stair. Mr. Gleeson said that the fins aren't original to the building and that the floors were floating. He said that he contests that the fins are what make it a boxy building.

Commissioner Haskamp said that the HPC has been consistent with what the recommendation has been and that they haven't received a complete application addressing all of the proposed details, and she asked the applicants if they plan to light the glass block or if they have an idea about how the artwork will look. Mr. Hawksford said that they never agreed to put anything on the corner – they only talked about moving the banners in and placing artwork on the first floor at the corner because they were only addressing the storefront in the application. He said that the glass block will be lit by the fluorescent lighting inside the garage, and that there are no plans to add lighting. Chair Manning asked if they planned to add spotlighting for anything that might

go in front of the glass block in the future. Mr. Hawksford said there was no plan for lighting the exterior of the building until they have a tenant. Commissioner Dana asked why the staircase is remaining. Mr. Gleeson said it was an old deteriorated fire escape and they thought it was an aesthetic element that contributes to the historic district. Mr. Hawksford said there are exposed fire escapes throughout Lowertown and that it was a way to introduce an historic element to a modern building in the district. Commissioner Trout-Oertel said that the issue is that the HPC hasn't seen any other solutions from the applicants and instead have seen the same proposal again and again. Mr. Hawksford said that they need a tenant and that the tenant will dictate a lot of the aesthetics of the building. Commissioner Trimble said that he wasn't in love with the glass block, but that they should consider installing some black block. Mr. Hawksford said that lighting is an aesthetic choice and will be dictated by the tenant.

Commissioner Trimble said that there was a clipped corner on a building in St. Paul that had horizontal metal pieces to give a sense of the boxy corner. He said that the building ultimately has an owner and the tenants may have to live within the guidelines of the ownership. Mr. Hawksford said that he has looked at newspaper articles citing complaints about the condition and appearance of the building since 1981, and that the city is lucky that someone is willing to rehab the building without public funding. Chair Manning said that the HPC is pleased that the project is moving forward, but the corner still needs to be resolved. Staff Spong returned to Commissioner Trimble's suggestion about adding the horizontal pieces and said that it had been suggested in the past and determined that it would draw too much attention to the two upper cantilevered levels. Staff Boulware asked the applicants what their second choice is if glass block is their first choice. Mr. Hawksford said that they don't have other choices, and that glass block is the economic choice that fits into the historic district, and if they do end up doing an egress stair, they can easily remove the glass block. Chair Manning said that there is a line of logic that will be hard for the Commission to follow because the applicants are suggesting a temporary solution that may well be a final solution. Commissioner Trout-Oertel said that the long-term solution is do something that's flexible and provide a framework for the changes to occur on.

Commissioner Dana asked if the fins were removed without HPC approval. Mr. Gleeson said that they were, and they were removed based on safety issues. Mr. Hawksford said that some were missing and some were cut when a sign was removed. Mr. Gleeson said it would be an exorbitant cost to replace them because they aren't made anymore. Chair Manning said that there were five months between when the applicants received the decision letter and when they contacted the HPC on March 24, and asked why there was a delay in the process. Mr. Hawksford said that after the second design review committee meeting they were taken off guard at being asked for another design solution, and they thought they'd be able to make decisions on some of the design elements instead of having to go in front of the HPC again. Commissioner Laffin said that he understood their frustration, but they aren't listening to the Commission and are throwing out red herrings about the tenants dictating what will happen on the upper floors, and he wishes they would reply to the request of the Commissioner and consider what they would do with the open corner. He said that they understand each other's positions and are just going around in circles at this point knowing that the applicants will end up making an appeal to City Council. Commissioner Trout-Oertel said that she thought it was too late to make an appeal. Staff Spong clarified that the purpose of this meeting is to make a decision so they can start another 14 day clock. Commissioner Trout-Oertel said that per Cecile Bedor's email the applicants had to present a fresh solution to reopen discussion, but that has not happened. Staff Spong said that it was supposed to be a revised proposal, and the term used was "substantially altered," which in this case is not that different from the October proposal. She said that the difference was that there was no lighting. Mr. Gleeson added that there was no longer glass block at the storefront. Staff Spong said that the glass block on the storefront was clearly denied at the last public hearing. Mr. Hawksford said that the glass block on the parking levels was never addressed by the HPC. Chair Manning said that they tried to address it by setting up the design review committee. Commissioner Trout-Oertel said that she thought they approved the glass block on the condition that some solution to complete

the corner was presented. Chair Manning asked if staff received any written testimony. Staff Spong said that she received one voicemail but was unable to connect with the person. Chair Manning closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Dana made a motion to adopt the first part of the staff recommendation to deny the application as proposed. Chair Manning clarified that Commissioner Dana moved the first recommendation and that the second paragraph is not included in the motion. Commissioner Haskamp seconded the motion. Commissioner Mazanec said that Commissioner Trout-Oertel's discussion sounded more in favor of the second staff recommendation. Commissioner Trout-Oertel said she thinks they should try to include the second option as part of the motion. She said that they often try to make an option a go by stating a condition under which they can approve it so they aren't just turning down the project, which is her concern with the motion being made. Staff Spong said that the condition tried to do that in October. She made the first staff recommendation to be very clear, and when staff makes a recommendation with a condition to revise the design its clear that they haven't gotten anywhere. The design review committee and applicant weren't able to work out a solution essentially because no solutions were presented, and it makes it challenging for HPC staff to implement a decision in this particular case. Chair Manning said that there is an advantage in clarity for this situation. Commissioner Dana asked if there was still a design review committee working on this project. Staff Spong said that she pulled the committee together when she got the inquiry and they met on April 11, and it was clear that there wasn't going to be a solution. Chair Manning asked if staff would find working with the design review committee helpful. Staff Spong said she took that part out of the staff report because there is no new proposal. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked staff if the second alternative recommendation is something the HPC shouldn't be considering. Chair Manning clarified that she asked if there is a way to adjust the motion that would pick up some element of the second recommendation to make the first recommendation stronger. Commissioner Dana said he made the motion the way he did without the second recommendation because the language is too vague, and there is no lack of clarity in the motion as he made it. Commissioner Hutter said that the applicant is not willing to entertain any other options for closing that corner and it is the HPC's sticking point in order to follow the guidelines. She said that if that can't be reached, then there is no reason to talk about the application anymore because it's not in the application to consider the corner. Commissioner Ferguson said he would vote against the motion because he does not have an issue with spatially reading the corner of the building with the horizontal beams that are there. He said that in view of the reality of getting something done, he thinks the second recommendation is more realistic. Commissioner Hutter said that the design is a vast improvement from what was there, so it's either a motion to further discuss the agreement or nothing. Commissioner Trimble said that he didn't agree with the second recommendation because it's too specific. Chair Manning said that the sentiment seemed to be for addressing the corner in a different way, and there could be a variety of ways of doing so, which is inherent in the second paragraph. but it's not part of the motion. Staff Spong clarified that two recommendations were presented, but it's not all of the possible recommendations.

The motioned passed 8-2. Commissioner Trimble asked if the applicants appeal in 14 days, will the HPC have another meeting before the City Council hearing. Staff Spong said yes because they have to put it into the City Council's data base system and City Council only does hearings on the first and third Wednesdays of every month and they notice it a week prior. Commissioner Trimble said that if there is an appeal, some HPC board member should attend so they can share their frustration about not being able to work with the applicants. Commissioner Dana said that one of the reasons why he prompted the motion was because of the issue about whether the proposal was a final solution. If they were to approve the proposal or invite a variation of the proposal as a temporary, it won't matter because if a tenant is never found, it's a permanent solution. He thinks "final solution" means a "complete solution" – it could be changed or amended at any time, but not by the HPC. Once the HPC gives it's blessing as a temporary solution, they no longer have a say, so they need to come to an agreement on a solution that they are willing to have in place for any given period of time. Chair Manning said

that the Executive Committee should ensure that the HPC has adequate representation at the City Council hearing. Commissioner Laffin said that he was willing to attend the hearing. He said the he and Commissioners Trout-Oertel, Haskamp and Mazanec were on the design review committee.

IX. Committee Reports

- A. Education Committee (Ferguson, Thomas, Trout-Oertel) Commissioner Ferguson suggested that the retreat groups meet again the second week of July. Only the fee group has met since the last meeting. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked if Commissioner Thomas felt like his committee needed to meet again. Commissioner Thomas said no, that his group still needed to discuss with staff and gather more information. Commissioner Ferguson said that the date to meet wasn't set in stone. He said that the biggest questions is what the end goal was for the group – is it a draft and will that happen this year. He said Ellen Biales suggested that they meet with the council members' aids first. Staff Spong said that fees were not part of the original draft, and they didn't talk about fees at the last public outreach. She said that additional suggestions will come from the enforcement group and that they need better language for demo delay. She said she is nervous about the way the demo-delay language is currently drafted is not going to be a very successful process given the city's nuisance and vacant building programs, and that at the same time they do the HPC ordinance, they will have to revise other parts of the code. She said it would be helpful to find where the holes are in the ordinance and to look at how other cities handle it, which is challenging because St. Paul has very different nuisance processes than other cities, including Minneapolis. Staff Boulware said that everyone meet and bring reports to the August Business Meeting. Chair Manning asked when the final language would be accepted. Staff Spong said that they need to have something drafted before going out to the public. Chair Manning asked when political leadership comes into play. Staff Spong said that they could identify council members to sponsor. Commissioner Trout-Oertel asked if they should bring drafts to the August meeting. Chair Manning said to just bring examples of how other cities have written their ordinance and areas where there are holes in St. Paul's ordinance.
- **B.** Greater Lowertown Master Plan Taskforce (Ferguson) Commissioner Ferguson said that he attended the community meeting on June 6. The draft plan will go to the task force sometime in June, then go to City Council before being added to the Comp Plan. He said he will see the draft preservation chapter before then. The next meeting is June 24.
- C. Saint Paul Historic Survey Partnership Project (Trimble, Manning) Commissioner Trimble said that he attended a meeting about the draft report and felt that there was not enough information on important figures. He said he was looking for information in the blue books, but that there was not enough time to add much to the draft.
- **D. 3M Advisory Committee/Workgroups update** (Trimble, Mazanec) Nothing to report.

X. ADJOURN: 6:20 P.M. Submitted by: B. Willging